

Elzie, Teri L

0075275

990923444
mail

From: Linville, Jenifer K
Sent: Thursday, September 23, 1999 9:05 AM
To: 'LARRY GADBOIS'; Linville, Jenifer K; Teel, Darci D; Elzie, Teri L; dmos461@ecy.wa.gov; jmcc461@ecy.wa.gov; Gano, Kenneth A (Ken); Weiss, Stephen G; dan_audet@mail.fws.gov; tom_obrien@mail.fws.gov; danl@timpt.nezperce.org; bharper@nwinfo.net; Jake_Jakabosky@or.blm.gov; Zeisloft, James H Jr; susan.c.hughs@state.or.us; jrw@ucinet.com
Subject: RE: EPA Comments. Draft DDE Report from BHI.

Larry,

Thank you for your constructive comments regarding the Preliminary Draft DDT/DDE report! I will be sure to implement your suggestions in the revised draft. If you have any other comments, feel free to pass them along!

Jenifer K. Linville - (509) 373-9628
DOE-RL, Environmental Restoration

RECEIVED
JAN 14 2008

EDMC

-----Original Message-----

From: LARRY GADBOIS [SMTP:GADBOIS.LARRY@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, September 22, 1999 4:15 PM
To: Jenifer_K_Linville@apimc01.rl.gov; ddteel@bhi-erc.com; tlelzie@bhi-erc.com; dmos461@ecy.wa.gov; jmcc461@ecy.wa.gov; KAGano@mail.bhi-erc.com; SGWeiss@mail.bhi-erc.com; dan_audet@mail.fws.gov; tom_obrien@mail.fws.gov; danl@timpt.nezperce.org; bharper@nwinfo.net; Jake_Jakabosky@or.blm.gov; james_h_jr_zeisloft@rl.gov; susan.c.hughs@state.or.us; jrw@ucinet.com
Cc: GADBOIS.LARRY@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: EPA Comments. Draft DDE Report from BHI.

E-Mail Memo

September 22, 1999

SUBJECT: EPA Comments on *Reassessment of Residual DDE on Three Remediated Hanford North (Wahluke) Slope Waste Sites and at the Horseshoe Landfill, Hanford, Washington*, Preliminary Draft dated September 1999

FROM: Larry Gadbois
TO: Hanford Natural Resource Trustees and the Report Authors.

I have reviewed the subject document that was handed out at the last trustee meeting, and I have no major comments. Minor comments are listed below. Thank you for the opportunity to review this document.

Page 4, 2nd last paragraph of *Birds*, last sentence.
Change *All samples will be analyzed* to *All samples were analyzed*.

Page 4, last paragraph, 1st line.
The document states *neither DDT nor DDD were detected in all insect and egg samples*. This sentence structure can mean that the contaminants were not detected in any insect or egg sample. It can also mean that while the contaminants were detected in some/many/most of the samples, it was not detected in all insect and egg samples*. I would suggest writing this sentence something like *Neither DDT nor DDD were detected in any insect or egg sample*. It wouldn't hurt to repeat what the lower limit of detection was, since it is mentioned for birds and insects only once, in the Birds section. So if someone was skimming this report for the insect results, they would miss the detection limit information.

Pages 5 and 6.

(1) For both Horseshoe Landfill and the Control Site, the first paragraph is about insect data, but doesn't say *insect*. I would add *insect* to the first sentence of each paragraph.

(2) For all five sites, there is one paragraph on insect results. Then a second paragraph that begins with bird results and ends with a few sentences of insect results. I'd suggest taking the insect portion of the second paragraph and move it to the end of the first paragraph.

Page 5, Horseshoe Landfill, 3rd line from the end.

I would suggest using ug/g rather than ppm to be consistent with the dominant usage throughout the rest of the report. A global search for *ppm* would be a good idea.

Page 5, Control Site, 1st paragraph, last sentence.

I'd suggest replacing *equivocal* with *identical* or *the same*.

Page 6, Site PSN-90, 2nd paragraph, 3rd line. Also in table 1.

Page 6, Site PSN-90, 2nd paragraph

The document states *of the 10 species collected at site PSN-90, 45.9% were *Eleodes hispilabris*. This species had the highest incidence across all the sampling sites*. Two points: (1) It may be beneficial to state that 45.9% is by number (as opposed to *by weight*). (2) As far as the highest incidence across all the sampling sites, it did not have the highest incidence at two of the sites. I think you mean it was the most abundant of all the insects collected. However it only beat **E. novoverrucula** by two individuals. Is there any importance behind making the *highest incidence* statement? Would the statement that 53% of the insects collected were *Eleodes* serve the same purpose?

Site H-06-LE, 1st paragraph

The document discusses concentrations *ranging from nondetected to 0.620 ug/g (Figure 8)*. The highest concentration on figure 8 is 0.670 ug/g.

Figure 5, Title

Typo *uG/G* should be *ug/g*.

--Larry--